

The Washington Herald

PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING BY
THE WASHINGTON HERALD COMPANY
1222 New York Avenue. Telephone MAIN 3300.

CLINTON T. BRANARD, President and Editor.
FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES:
THE S. C. BECKWITH SPECIAL AGENCY.
New York Office. Tribune Bldg.
Chicago Office. Tribune Bldg.
St. Louis Office. Third Nat. Bank Bldg.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J. REPRESENTATIVE:
C. K. ABBOT. Guarantee Trust Bldg.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES BY CARRIER:
Daily and Sunday. 45 cents per month.
Daily and Sunday. \$1.40 per year.
Daily, without Sunday. 35 cents per month.
Daily, without Sunday. \$1.05 per year.
Entered at the postoffice at Washington, D. C., as second-class mail matter.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1915.

A Line o' Cheer Each Day o' the Year.

By JOHN KENDRICK BANGS.

First printing of an original poem, written daily for The Washington Herald.

RISEN.

Hast fallen in the race?
Let this be thy beginning.
Rich prizes by God's grace
Still lie here for thy winning.
Tall oaks by Poets sung
In some far distant hour
From fallen acorns sprung
Are symbols true of power.
(Copyright, 1915.)

Naturally we shall look for an optimistic message to Congress next December.

Well, October is here, and, light as hard as they can, the allies can hardly hope to make good the Kaiser's prediction.

Some famous persons have been admitted to the New York University's hall of fame, and some have been admitted without having fame thrust upon them in the process.

The making of war munitions for the allies is becoming almost as hazardous for the men engaged in it in this country as service in the battle fronts is for the soldiers of Europe.

Since, according to the official reports, both the Germans and the French are victorious day by day in their struggle on the western front, it must be concluded that their only object is the killing of men.

The New York World and the New York Evening Post would have the country believe that diplomacy is an invention of Woodrow Wilson's for stopping submarine warfare, whereas it was something invented by the British naval experts that did the trick.

Great Britain has filed a claim for \$50,000 damages done to the property of its subjects in Vera Cruz at the time of American occupation. Just about enough to pay postage on London's answers to our claims growing out of interference with commerce.

"When a child is born who is the one to be congratulated?" asks an eager correspondent of Annie Laurie of "Advice to Girls" fame. Opinions differ, sweet communicant, but there is a consensus of opinion that the doctor is the only one that has a lead-pipe cinch.

A man who handed out tips of \$20 right and left to the servants of a New York hotel was taken to an insane asylum for examination. Insanity, if the plea heard in the courts may be believed, more often manifests itself in a desire to acquire other people's money.

Public school officials are considering the practicability of using the Naval Hospital and other government buildings to relieve the congestion in the schoolhouses. And the time is approaching for a renewal of the discussion on Capitol Hill as to what shall be done with the District's money.

Two pet cats belonging to an Alexandria Bay hotel keeper who died the other day were chloroformed and placed in the coffin with him in obedience to instructions contained in a letter to the undertaker. The strange thing is that no one is excited over the incident, not even the S. P. C. A.

While waiting to see Postmaster General Burleson Thomas A. Edison made a study of the goldfish swimming in an aquarium, and nobody spoke to him for fear of interfering with the solution of some submarine problem. Add again he may only have been wondering whether goldfish would make good bait for salmon or bass fishing.

"Just remember," said John D. Rockefeller, jr., addressing the miners at Sunrise, Wyo., "I am doing everything I can for you, but times are hard now and the men who have put their money into this enterprise are not making anything. But times will improve, with a better demand for our products, there will be more work and all of us will prosper." Rather a pointed illustration by young Mr. Rockefeller of the old lesson that what injures capital injures labor.

Pro-Germans in New York are organizing a country-wide campaign to injure banks which participate in the Anglo-French loan. They admit that a systematic effort will be made not only in the large cities throughout the country, but in the smaller places to impair the resources, by withdrawal of deposits, of every bank that puts any money into the bonds. If not in New York, perhaps in some other State they will run up against laws that may restrict their liberty and halt their pursuit of happiness.

Miss Margaret Wilson has discovered something on which the President and the two living former Presidents agree. Discussing the benefits of a more general use of the public schools of the country she said: "President Wilson, former President Taft and former President Roosevelt are as one in lacking the community center movement as the essence of common sense and one of the great opportunities before the people of the country." The merit of the proposition must therefore be quite unassailable.

A \$240,000,000 Revenue Shortage.

The Secretary of the Treasury announces that he will recommend to Congress that the emergency revenue act, which expires by statutory limitation on December 31, 1915, be extended until peace is restored in Europe, and that the present duty on sugar, which the Underwood tariff act provided should be removed on May 1, 1916, be retained until "normal customs conditions are restored." With these two sources of revenue in operation the government at the present time is spending at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year more than it receives, so that if Congress adopts Mr. McAdoo's recommendations, as it must inevitably, it will make no step of progress toward meeting the deficit. With the present ratio of income to expenditures maintained Congress must provide some new means for raising another \$100,000,000 a year to bring the government out even. This, of course, does not take into account the money that undoubtedly will have to be appropriated for the national defense, which has been estimated at anywhere from \$300,000,000 to \$700,000,000, and for which separate provision will be made, probably by an issue of bonds.

Secretary McAdoo's recommendations could easily have been anticipated; he has taken the only course open to him, though it necessarily involves a confession of the total failure of the Underwood act as a revenue producer. Summed up the country's present financial condition proves that the tariff law falls short of yielding the revenue its framers and supporters calculated on by about \$240,000,000, since the sugar duty, which the Underwood act provided should be removed on May 1, 1916, yields about \$30,000,000, the special revenue act of war tax about \$90,000,000, while the annual deficit amounts to about \$100,000,000.

All the blame for this \$240,000,000 shortage the administration leaders place upon the war. Speaker Champ Clark says there is a "difficulty with the revenue" due to the war, and Secretary McAdoo wants the sugar duty retained until "normal customs conditions are restored." And yet the statistics of the Department of Commerce show that in the first year of the war there was a falling off in the value of our imports of only 12 per cent or \$220,000,000. Plainly this decrease does not explain a "difficulty with the revenue" that leaves the country \$240,000,000 short of what the lawmakers had figured on.

The people will go on paying the special war tax in time of peace and they will contribute the \$100,000,000 that is still needed to make ends meet, in whatever way Congress may dictate, but when the 1916 campaign rolls around the administration's financing will call for explanation, and that means that the operation of the new tariff will be subject to deep scrutiny. There is no reason to doubt that this will be the big issue.

The District and the New Congress.

It is more than a hopeful sign for Washington that leading members of its business and civic organizations are thus early manifesting a serious interest in the selection of committees on the District of Columbia in the Sixty-fourth Congress. As is shown by the interviews obtained by The Herald yesterday, which are published in this issue, plans are well under way for concerted action by all of the representative and influential associations of citizens and business men with the object of co-operating with the leaders in the new Congress in matters relating to the District's welfare, one of which—the selection of members of the District committees—is of first importance. As a member of one of the trade organizations said yesterday the people of Washington have never been so well organized as at present or working so harmoniously and unitedly for the best interests of the Capital. This being the case it should be easy to impress upon the new Congress the fact that Washington speaks with one voice upon all subjects pertaining to its interests, and a friendly basis of co-operation between the citizens and the men who make the laws for them should be established as a natural result. There is no reason why the ruinous and deplorable antagonism of the last Congress should be carried over into the new one. Not only did it result in serious injury to the District, but it retarded the work of both Houses and in the end threatened to defeat important national legislation. Once assured that it is in touch with the representatives of the people of Washington united for the advancement of its best interests, the new Congress would welcome the opportunity to co-operate. A start has been made toward bringing about this happy condition of affairs, and the undertaking is one in which every organization in the city should have a share. It should not be permitted to lag for a moment between this time and the convening of Congress.

The Navy Yard Wage Dispute.

A serious dispute over wages is in progress between the government of the United States on one side and the employees of the Washington Navy Yard on the other. The men claimed that they were receiving lower pay than those engaged in similar work in private establishments, and, after months of delay the justice of their claim was established and an increase of wages was offered them. The amount of the increase, however, is now declared by the men to be wholly unsatisfactory, and there is serious talk of a strike. A similar situation existing between a big corporation and its employees would arouse public interest all over the country, there would be a demand for arbitration and if the situation became acute perhaps government authorities would take a hand. If the corporation refused to arbitrate it would be indignantly denounced. The situation at present existing between the United States government and the navy yard employees appears to be no different. There is a wide difference between the two sides of the controversy and danger of a strike. Why should not their differences be arbitrated? Why should not Uncle Sam set an example for other employers and propose that a board of arbitration be chosen to investigate, discover all the facts and fix a scale of wages? The spectacle of a great government engaged in a prolonged dispute over wages is not an inspiring one, and the curtain should be rung down on it without delay. Why not arbitrate?

An Effective Blockade.

Speaking of blockades, true and false, there seems to be no question as to the efficacy of the closed slides in the Panama Canal. They have closed the channel for a month at least, and neutral and unneutral commerce suffers alike. Possibly the greatest engineering feat in the history of the world was not actually completed when the announcement was made—New York World.

Peace.

The Pilgrim Dads, renowned in song, were men of power as well as prayer, and when the redskins breezed along to separate them from their hair they grabbed the blunderbuss, by jings! and filled him full of copper slugs. John Carroll was a godly gink; there was no varnish on his pew; but when the thrifty British kink dunned him for kale that wasn't due he took his gun and left the house, merely ejaculating, "Raus!" And Washington, our father George—the love of peace obsessed his soul; but when he got to Valley Forge, "Boys," he observed, "we're in the hole, though by and by I trust we shall raise holy Cain with George et al. Our powder and our socks are gone, the commissariat's in a mess, so let us pause to ponder on the joys of unpreparedness. We're dished—unless I Parleyvoos will send us cannon balls and shoes!" His good advice they soon forgot, and when the British came once more they chased our fathers round the lot. (They were expert at shedding gore.) But still we fit—and gave them beans in an affair at New Orleans. Abe Lincoln was a peaceful wight. He wore no bullion on his clothes, but when the moment came to fight he cussed a mess of Black Hawk oaths and "Boys," he says, "it's up to you to see the sacred Union through!" We do not call them brutes and thugs, although they bathed in vats of gore, or say "They must have all been bugs to get into that horrid war!" We honor them as best we may and pay them 7 cents a day. Then let us can the silly boobies who call preparedness a crime, and whistle through their bronchial tubes (at fifteen hundred bones a time), about the sin of raising sons to shoulder fratricidal guns. And when some nation feels its odds and hands out a bunch of sass, let's have a flock of fighting boys to argue with instead of gas, and army corps and guns enough to call the other fellow's bluff. Then those who want to treat us right will find we are a peaceful land, and those who aim to start a fight will have a proper fight on hand. And let the nation's watchword run: "Friendship for all and lip from none!"—Herbert Bretherton.

As a rule, when we have trouble, instead of conning in the smallest circuit, we let it range over the whole range of our consciousness. In this way it secures session of us and makes us its prey. Through thinking about it and talking about it and inviting others to contribute to the emphasis, we further enslave ourselves.

Often the wisest course is to say nothing about it and, so far as possible, to keep our thoughts busy elsewhere.

If we can only manage to give our thoughts wholesome work when there is mischief making its appeal, we have already won a victory.

Much depends on our first relation to a trouble. If we yield, our recovery becomes at once harder. If we resist, we have already secured an advantage. When the trouble comes back, it is likely to have less confidence and less power. The worst mistake we can make is by abandoning ourselves. We all know those people who, as soon as trouble comes, at once refuse to allow them to be bothered by it, and then, when it comes again, they are just about as good as new.

Perhaps they are just about as good as new, but they are not. The meaning of all such expressions is: "I must stay at home and think of my trouble and be just as unhappy as I can." In this attitude there is nearly always lack of consideration for others.

One's own refusal to participate in some projected diversion may be a denial to others or the cause of gloom. How much better it would be to put aside the trouble for a time and to do one's best to enjoy. There are, of course, those who consider such a course heartless or even immoral. They take an attitude toward trouble established by convention. It makes them feel that they ought to play up, that they ought to react in ways that show a proper appreciation of the trouble, a kind of deference.

And yet we all admire the attitude of self-forgetfulness, of ability to rise above depression or to conquer it either for one's own sake or for the sake of others. We regard it as heroic, an expression of generous and noble character. Best of all we like what we call "good losers." For their cheerfulness under disappointment we give them not merely praise but warm personal liking.

A case that came within my experience seemed to me to express a very reasonable attitude of mind. A guest at a large party in a country house woke up one morning and found that a considerable sum of money had disappeared from his pocket. He knew that, on his arrival the night before, the money had been in his pocket. The chances were that, during his absence at dinner, the money had been taken. He was not at all disturbed, someone had come into the room and gone through the pockets. If he were to inform his host there would be an unpleasant excitement. Suspicion would probably fasten itself on the servants. The party would be spoiled. After thinking the matter over very carefully, the guest decided that the best thing to do was to say nothing and to accept the loss philosophically.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

There are those who would insist that the guest did wrong. The situation showed that there was a thief in the house. If the thief happened to be a servant, the stealing would go on. Ought not the host to be put on his guard? Ought not the money to be recovered? There is a rather nice question involved here. But it is based on an assumption. So often, through being suspected, servants are made to suffer, particularly the women. As soon as that loss became known, every servant in the house would have been uneasy, perhaps watched. The thief might be discovered, but the innocent complications affecting persons wholly innocent. Then, too, the money might not have been stolen at all. It might have been lost. On the other hand it might have been stolen by a guest. If the loss had been a serious deprivation to the owner of the money, there might have been reason for crying so much disturbance. But, this time, the disturbance would have been far more serious than the loss.

OUR COUNTRY—OUR PRESIDENT

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

WOODROW WILSON

A TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Published by a special arrangement with the President through The McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

(Copyright, 1901, 1902, by Harper & Brothers.)
(Copyright, 1915, by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate.)

The war with France was brief and of no significant consequence in itself. No formal declaration of hostilities was made. There was only a season's sharp retaliation.

A separate Navy Department was created (April 30, 1788); existing treaties with France were declared abrogated (April 7, 1790); American vessels of war were expressly authorized to attack French cruisers (July 2, 1790); and, according to the French, the formal abrogation of the treaty of 1763, which had accorded to French privateers privileges in American ports which it was no longer wise or convenient to accord them, and which had pledged the United States to such a defence of the French possessions in the West Indies as they might be justified in undertaking.

Measures were taken to raise an army, and General Washington was asked to take command of it. The publication of the extraordinary proposals of MM. X, Y, and Z to the American commissioners had effectively silenced any further talk of peace, and war with the country's one-time friend and ally had become for the moment all too popular.

Often the wisest course is to say nothing about it and, so far as possible, to keep our thoughts busy elsewhere.

If we can only manage to give our thoughts wholesome work when there is mischief making its appeal, we have already won a victory.

Much depends on our first relation to a trouble. If we yield, our recovery becomes at once harder. If we resist, we have already secured an advantage. When the trouble comes back, it is likely to have less confidence and less power. The worst mistake we can make is by abandoning ourselves. We all know those people who, as soon as trouble comes, at once refuse to allow them to be bothered by it, and then, when it comes again, they are just about as good as new.

Perhaps they are just about as good as new, but they are not. The meaning of all such expressions is: "I must stay at home and think of my trouble and be just as unhappy as I can." In this attitude there is nearly always lack of consideration for others.

One's own refusal to participate in some projected diversion may be a denial to others or the cause of gloom. How much better it would be to put aside the trouble for a time and to do one's best to enjoy. There are, of course, those who consider such a course heartless or even immoral. They take an attitude toward trouble established by convention. It makes them feel that they ought to play up, that they ought to react in ways that show a proper appreciation of the trouble, a kind of deference.

And yet we all admire the attitude of self-forgetfulness, of ability to rise above depression or to conquer it either for one's own sake or for the sake of others. We regard it as heroic, an expression of generous and noble character. Best of all we like what we call "good losers." For their cheerfulness under disappointment we give them not merely praise but warm personal liking.

A case that came within my experience seemed to me to express a very reasonable attitude of mind. A guest at a large party in a country house woke up one morning and found that a considerable sum of money had disappeared from his pocket. He knew that, on his arrival the night before, the money had been in his pocket. The chances were that, during his absence at dinner, the money had been taken. He was not at all disturbed, someone had come into the room and gone through the pockets. If